

House of Representatives, April 2, 1998. The Committee on Judiciary reported through REP. LAWLOR, 99th DIST., Chairman of the Committee on the part of the House, that the bill ought to pass.

AN ACT CONCERNING THE INTERSTATE COMPACT ON PAROLEE SUPERVISION.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

1 (NEW) (a) No person who has been released on
2 parole by any other state that is a party to the
3 compact set forth in section 54-133 of the general
4 statutes may enter and reside in this state unless
5 granted permission by this state as required by
6 said section.

7 (b) Any person who violates the provisions of
8 this section shall be guilty of a class D felony.

9 JUD COMMITTEE VOTE: YEA 39 NAY 0 JF

* * * * *

"THE FOLLOWING FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND BILL ANALYSIS ARE PREPARED FOR THE BENEFIT OF MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, SOLELY FOR PURPOSES OF INFORMATION, SUMMARIZATION AND EXPLANATION AND DO NOT REPRESENT THE INTENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OR EITHER HOUSE THEREOF FOR ANY PURPOSE."

* * * * *

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT - BILL NUMBER HB 5702

STATE IMPACT	Potential Future Impact, see explanation below
MUNICIPAL IMPACT	None
STATE AGENCY(S)	Board of Parole, Other Criminal Justice Agencies

EXPLANATION OF ESTIMATES:

Compliance with the bill would increase the period of parolee supervision in some cases and decrease it in other cases resulting in no net impact for the Board of Parole from the bill. As of 2/28/98, there were 186 out-of-state parolees (about 20% of all parolees) being supervised in Connecticut and 143 Connecticut parolees in other states.

In addition, the bill's provisions concerning enhanced criminal penalties would result in increased pressures on the criminal justice system. Over the long term, these pressures would lead to a need for increased criminal justice resources, especially for incarceration and community supervision. Although direct cost quantification is problematic, it should be noted that SHB 5021 (the revised Appropriations Act for FY 1998-99 as favorably reported by Appropriations) includes \$5.4 million to address overcrowding in the state's prisons and jails. In addition, the Public Defender Services Commission is currently under suit by the American Civil Liberties Union relating to the adequacy of funding for public defenders. Increases in criminal penalties will at some point require additional funds for criminal justice agencies in order

to maintain adequate enforcement of other criminal laws.

* * * * *

OLR BILL ANALYSIS

HB 5702

AN ACT CONCERNING THE INTERSTATE COMPACT ON PAROLEE SUPERVISION

SUMMARY: This bill makes it a crime for a person released on parole by another state under the Uniform Act for Out-of-State Parolee Supervision to move to or live in Connecticut without permission (see COMMENT). Neither the bill nor existing law specifies who is responsible for granting permission, but presumably for parolees it would be the Board of Parole.

The bill makes such a violation a class D felony, which is punishable by a fine of up to \$5,000, imprisonment for one to five years, or both.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1998

BACKGROUND

Uniform Act for Out-of-State Parolee Supervision

The uniform act authorizes the governor to enter a compact with other states to allow states that release people on probation or parole (sending states) to permit them to live in and be supervised by other states (receiving states). People who are residents of, or have family and can get a job in, a receiving state have a right to move to the receiving state. People who are not residents and have no family in the receiving state can still move with that state's permission. And before granting permission the receiving state has the right to investigate the home and prospective employment of the person desiring to move.

COMMENT

Ambiguity Concerning Permission

It is not clear if the criminal penalty authorized by

the bill would apply to all parolees released under the compact or only to those who are not residents and have no family in Connecticut and therefore must obtain the state's permission before moving to Connecticut (CGS Sec. 54-133).

COMMITTEE ACTION

Judiciary Committee

Joint Favorable Report
Yea 39 Nay 0